

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 5, 10-13, and 16, 17 and 22 have been amended. Claims 23-45 have been added. Claims 1-5, 10-17, and 22-45 are pending for further examination.

Applicant appreciates Examiner's indication that claims 6-9 and 18-21 are allowed.

Claims 1-5, 11-17 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. Applicant has corrected the alleged problems with these claims and respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 10-14, 16 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oakes et al. (U.S. App. No. 2004/0063498) in view of Burr (U.S. App. No. 2003/0079003).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "said displayed parent device information capable of including the information of a plurality of parent devices." Claims 11-13 recite similar limitations.

According to the Examiner, this claim element is taught by the combination of Oakes and Burr. The Examiner first alleges that Oakes contemplates a "list" of servers, based on the notion that Oakes discloses "a selectable server unit." While Oakes does discuss "a selectable server unit," there is no requirement or teaching inherent in the words "selectable server unit" that requires that there be a plurality of servers present. Further, an examination of Oakes reveals that every discussion of network configuration contemplates and discusses a single server, while the same teachings repeatedly refer to a plurality of clients. Thus, it appears that Oakes actually intended that there only be a single server.

Specifically, if a single server was displayed, it could still be characterized as selectable. One could either select it, or one could not. Selectable does not inherently include “more than one.”

The Examiner appears to agree, and concedes that Oakes does not teach or suggest a parent device list “including a plurality of parent devices.” To compensate for this deficiency, the Examiner introduces Burr, alleged to disclose displaying a list of devices (plural) on a terminal. Combining Oakes and Burr, however, does not produce the desired result, as Oakes is directed at a system only having a single parent device. Specifically, even if Burr did add a teaching that all the parent devices of Oakes were to be displayed, the list would still only consist of a single member, the single parent device contemplated by Oakes.

Further, the teachings of Burr make it clear that the solution presented therein is not applicable to the present invention. Specifically, claim 1 recites “a plurality of mobile game units, which function as a parent device or a child device.” Burr, on the other hand, is directed at an ad-hoc network, wherein each device “acts as both client and server.” ([0004]). Burr further directly contrasts the teachings thereof (directed at ad-hoc networks) with a typical network setting (as contemplated by both the claims and Oakes). ([0004]). Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art, upon reading this, would not have sought to apply the teachings of Burr to a system such as Oakes, because Burr itself explicitly contrasts Oakes’ system with Burr’s taught system.

For at least these reasons, claims 1 and 11-13 should be allowable. Claims 2, 4, 10, 14, 16 and 22 should be allowable based on their dependency from allowable independent claims.

Claims 3 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oakes/Burr in view of Bluetooth Specification Version 1.0B. Bluetooth Specification, however,

fails to cure the deficiencies noted above. Thus, claims 3 and 15 should be allowable based on their dependency from allowable independent claims.

Claims 5 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oakes/Burr in view of Darling et al (PCT Pub. WO 93/23125). Darling, however, fails to cure the deficiencies noted above. Thus, claims 5 and 17 should be allowable based on their dependency from allowable independent claims.

New claims 14-22 have been added. Claims 18-21 are computer readable memory-medium claims corresponding to allowable claims 6-9 and should be allowable for at least the same reason claims 6-9 are allowable. Claims 14-17 and 22 should be allowable based at least on their dependency from allowable claim 12.

New claims 23-45 are also believed to be allowable over the prior art of record.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention defined by the amended claims herein is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.


Should the Examiner have any questions, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned attorney at the phone number below.

TANAKA, S. et al.  
Appl. No. 10/689,073  
April 21, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:



Raymond Y. Mah  
Reg. No. 41,426

RYM:lmj  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100